EPA/USACE SUPERFUND PROGRAM

Senior Management Review Meeting - Day 1

October 19, 1999
0800-1700

Welcome and Introductions

William Zobel (DynCorp) began the Senior Management Review (SMR) meeting by having attendees introduce themselves. The list of attendees for the meeting is provided in Appendix 1. Attendees included representatives from USACE Headquarters, EPA Headquarters, Major Subordinate Commands, Districts, and EPA Regions. The agenda for the meeting is provided in Appendix 2.

Richard Caspe: USACE Support of Region 2 Activities

Richard Caspe reported on the successes Region 2 has enjoyed because of its interaction with the USACE. Approximately $300 million in Interagency Agreements (IAGs) with the USACE were made for activities such as construction, five-year reviews, and contractor oversight. Examples of USACE involvement with Region 2 include the Welsbach, Pepe Fields, Grand Street, and Federal Creosote Superfund sites. USACE team members have helped with remediation and relocation efforts for sites containing vegetable oil decomposition products, radiation tailings, and creosote from wood treatment facilities. Mike Scarano serves as Region 2's Business Manager and provides the primary point of contact between the EPA and the USACE.

Brigadier General Stephen Rhoades: Strategic Context of USACE and EPA Interaction

General Rhoades outlined the strategic and business management objectives behind effective coordination between the USACE and EPA. According to the General, "this meeting is about good government." Coordination between EPA and USACE demonstrates a commitment to valuing the interests of citizens above the interests of organizations.

Larry Reed: Superfund Program Overview

Larry Reed provided general information on the EPA Superfund Program and Region 2 involvement with the USACE. Roughly $300 million flows annually from EPA to USACE in support of the Superfund Program. USACE was involved with relocating displaced citizens from the Methyl Parathion Site and the Escambia Site in Louisiana. Future USACE support is needed to support the Superfund Site Redevelopment Initiative and five-year review inspections. Mr. Reed also mentioned the need to involve the USACE Civil Works organizations in dealing with sites like Hylebos in Washington.

Bunnatine Greenhouse: USACE Contracting Strategies

Bunnatine Greenhouse reported that USACE established a Headquarters Integrated Product Delivery Team to optimize the contracts management process. This approach ensures that the Contracting Officer is included from the onset to improve customer satisfaction with the entire process. Other improvements may come through increased use of umbrella contracts to expedite the flow of money between USACE resources. Ms. Greenhouse also encouraged asking key questions to ensure that the needs of the customers are met, as USACE should be working to "delight customers" instead of merely "satisfying customers."

Superfund Program Status

John Smith: Program Direction and Funding

John Smith reported that his primary job is to look at the project pipeline and report to management. He estimates roughly a $100 million reduction in the EPA budget and warns that reductions in EPA's budget may be more frequent or drastic in the future. Mr. Smith recommended that Regions and Districts redistribute funds as necessary to invest in the completion of all necessary projects. Reinvestment will also demonstrate to other agencies overseeing the EPA budget that projects are completed as efficiently as possible. Mr. Smith also encouraged looking at designs for efficiency and moving them into construction phases as soon as possible.

Larry Reed: Reauthorization Update

Larry Reed then discussed the status of reauthorization of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). Mr. Reed expressed optimism for the continued support of the program. Although the Trust fund taxing authority expired in 1995, Congress has increasingly supplemented the annual Superfund appropriation with funds from the general revenue. The FY 2000 Superfund appropriation is split 50/50 between the Trust fund and general revenue.

Jim Strait: Superfund Program Numbers for the USACE

Jim Strait outlined the USACE Superfund funding for fiscal year 1999 and pointed out that $30 million of unobligated funds were returned to the EPA. Funding for fiscal year 1999 was outlined as follows:

Funding

Gross	**$307 Million**
Net	**$277 Million**
Obligations	**$322 Million**
Expenditures	**$273 Million**

Mr. Strait pointed out that Region 2 is USACE's largest EPA customer having provided more than $1.3 billion of the total $3.4 billion total program funding to date. USACE identified where $412 million are unobligated and some may potentially be returned to EPA. Mr. Strait will determine the details and report them to John Smith.

One-Door to the Corps

Shaheer Alvi: Virtual Team Approach

According to Shaheer Alvi, the success of Region 2 and USACE interaction comes from knowing where resources exist in both organizations. Key players from the USACE include John Kirschbaum, Rich McCollum, Mike Scarano, and Tom Simmons. Also critical to the success of EPA-USACE interaction, are electronic media for maintaining updated information on the needs of both organizations. Region 2 relies on Lotus Notes databases containing Statements of Work (SOW), Assumptions of Task Execution, Work Breakdown Structures (WBS), and Independent Government Cost Estimates (IGCE).

Mike Scarano: Business Management Process

Mike Scarano presented the concept of there being "one door to the Corps." Mr. Scarano called for close coordination between the USACE and EPA Remedial Project Managers (RPM), Task Managers (TM), and Project Managers (PM). The Federal Creosote Superfund site is an example of this close coordination. The site involved demolishing homes and relocating residents to temporary shelters. Three USACE Districts were involved in the remediation and relocation activities.

Bill Brasse commented that the advantage of the USACE Business Management process is to pull together resources and expertise into a central design. Presenting this matrix of USACE skills enables the EPA customer to be a smarter shopper and meet its objectives faster.

Ken Skahn: Office of Inspector General Audit of Independent Government Cost Estimates

Ken Skahn reported that Tina Williams is preparing an Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE) guidance document. The document will clarify many of the issues discussed in an Office of Inspector General (OIG) audit of Response Action Contract (RAC) IGCEs.

Removals/Remedial Seamless Transition Pilot

John Kirschbaum: Pilot Projects with Region 6

John Kirschbaum reported on the transition of the Garland Creosote Superfund site from the USACE Rapid Response Program to the local district. According to Mr. Kirschbaum, the goal of USACE should be to

optimize support to EPA. Improvements may come from restructuring cost-reimbursement contracts and involving the USACE Rapid Response Team earlier in the remedial process.

Jim Mullins: Region 6 Perspective on Removal Process

Jim Mullins reported that Emergency and Rapid Response Services (ERRS) and Superfund Technical Assessment and Response Team (START) contracts are the primary contract vehicle for removal activity. ERRS funds equipment operation while START funds technical assessment. In Region 6, roughly 70% of removal activities involve time-critical response. An additional 25% of removal activities are classified as emergency measures. Non-time critical removal activities represent a small fraction the Region's activities, but are increasing in number.

Mr. Mullins also commented that there is an uneven distribution of funds between Regions for removal activities. Removal requires tight cost tracking and the ability, through the On-Scene Coordinator (OSC), to react quickly. The OSC has delegated authority from the National Contingency Plan (NCP) and the Stafford Act to act semi-autonomously to complete the removal as quickly as possible.

There are four basic areas for USACE involvement in response activities:

- relocation;
- traditional contract management;
- extend OSC capabilities; and
- transition from removal to remedial activities.

Relocation examples include the methyl parathion site in Mississippi, where residents had illegally sprayed methyl parathion in their homes posing adverse effect human health. A urinalysis test demonstrated actual contamination of the residents. Work commenced quickly at the site because of the quick turn around of funds provided by a generic Interagency Agreement (IAG).

There is a role for the USACE in daily cost tracking and financial risk management of contractors, but fundamental differences between removal and remedial programs should be understood. Most removal actions take less than 6 months and cost roughly $2 million or less. There is little budget provided for a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) or engineering studies before the removal takes place.

The transition of removal to remedial activities is weak within EPA. There are often entirely separate teams for removal and remedial activities that must be replaced as the transition progresses. The Garland Creosote site demonstrated that USACE can provide support during this transition process, as the same USACE contract team was involved throughout the remedy process. Future efforts should strengthen the contractual match between USACE Rapid Response teams and the USACE Districts.

Mr. Mullins reported that the most contentious issue he encountered using the USACE was the 10% flat rate

charge for Rapid Response Contract. At Garland Creosote, 60-70% of the actual costs are for transport and disposal. The 10% fee is high for such transport and disposal activities. The key to addressing this issue is accountability.

John Kirschbaum pointed out that the 10% flat fee is charged to the military, but should be reimbursable for civil customers. According to Dan Tosoni, readiness capabilities also cost money. The 10% flat rate may allow travel and coordination with field personnel from afar that allows effective communication with the OSC.

Mr. Mullins agreed by saying that a culture change may be needed within EPA to allow USACE to oversee the contractor. Many OSCs may be uncomfortable with this approach. Cal Curington recommended that USACE Districts receive training in cost-reimbursement contracts to address these issues correctly. Greater expertise will make the transition of teams between the removal and remedial processes smoother and foster trust. Mr. Tosoni also recommended using the correct contractual language to smooth this transition and involve the Rapid Response Team as soon as possible.

Relocation Projects

Cal Curington: Introduction to USACE Outreach Activities

Mr. Curington began the panel discussion by introducing USACE involvement in the relocation process for the Escambia and Methyl Parathion sites. At Escambia, some of the lessons learned included a need to coordinate closely with EPA on addressing the needs of the general public. USACE should be included in EPA training on effective communication techniques.

Judith Gutierrez: Methyl Parathion Site Activities and Lessons Learned

Methyl parathion is a pesticide used to control boll weevil populations. The pesticide has a low persistence when used outdoors and exposed to sunlight, but is very toxic when contained indoors. In 1996, 190 families had to be relocated within 24 hours because of illegal spraying of the pesticide inside their homes.

Site activities involved coordination with EPA, USACE, U.S. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, the Louisiana Department of Health, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. USACE's involvement focused on property appraisals and the relocation of residents. Options for relocation from the site included the following:

- Government furnished temporary housing;
- Residents located their own housing and received a $450 bimonthly reimbursement; or
- Residents located their own housing and then submitted expense receipts of up to $1,200 per month.

Some of the complexities of the site were that the furnishings within the homes had to be tested and decontaminated. USACE real estate officers also assisted in negotiating leases for tenants and inspecting pre-

fabricated homes. To date, 148 families, consisting of 675 people, were relocated. Total costs for the relocation are approximately $1.35 million. Over half of the money went for permanent relocation.

John Hanson: Experience with Relocation

John Hanson related his experiences with relocating 16 families from a condominium complex in Hoboken, New Jersey. The condominium complex was originally a mercury vapor lamp factory and was contaminated with nearly 1000 kilograms of mercury in the flooring. USACE involvement included providing temporary housing for displaced residents. One of the difficulties encountered at the site was the need to relocate small businesses as many of the tenants were artists with studios in their residences.

Mr. Hanson felt that the site was generally a success because of the development of positive press through members of Congress and environmental groups. Officials at the site demonstrated honesty in conveying information to the general public and developed a rapport with the community.

Pat Seppi: Fostering EPA/USACE Involvement

Pat Seppi reminded the group that successful public outreach involves addressing the human and sentimental issues associated with relocation activities. Some relocation projects have made the USACE seem to disregard the concerns of citizens, who then viewed the EPA as their savior. USACE needs to learn from the experience EPA has and work as part of a team to address these sites.

Tammy Thompson: Relocation Experiences at the Escambria Site

Tammy Thompson reported on the status of relocation activities at the Escambria site in Pensacola, Florida. The site, a former wood treatment facility, consists of single family homes, duplexes, and apartments. Of the tracts of land, 127 tracts have been purchased and 23 are in negotiation. Nine tracts have not been negotiated because of title problems. The average differential payment, used to compensate for the increased value of the property for Escambia was $18,500. Approximately 12 relocations were "relocations of last resort," because their differential payments exceeded $22,500. Down payment assistance was provided as a reimbursement or as a flat fee based on the number of rooms. Most residents elected to select their own home.

Some of the challenges faced at the site included a death of a property owner and the emotional and psychological impacts of relocating groups of people. Many of the residents at the site were elderly and very attached to their homes. Flexibility in addressing the needs of the residents was an important step to ensuring the success of the site.

Bob Warda commented that the Chicago Methyl Parathion site encountered many similar problems. Mr. Warda pointed out that in Chicago, school childred were transported back to their original schools. Incentives also need to be given to the landlords not to lease to another tenant after the first tenant is relocated.

Larry Reed asked what happened if owners did not agree to the price offered by the EPA. Ms. Thompson explained that the appeal process consisted of the following steps:

- The decision is appealed to a panel of USACE District staff.
- A written decision is handed down from the USACE District.
- If the decision made by the USACE District is still contended, an appeal is submitted to the Regional EPA office.
- EPA is consulted on the final decision.

Ms. Thompson and Ms. Seppi also pointed out that the use of outside estimators is at the discretion of the EPA region. For Escambia, appraisals were conducted internally and only submitted to external appraisers during the appeal process.

Drake Chemical Superfund Site Success Stories

Dave Polish: Site Activities

The Drake site in Lock Haven, Pennsylvania, consists of 11 acres of a former dye and intermediary chemical factory. Contaminants present on site include beta napthalene, which research has shown to cause kidney cancer. The remedy specified in the original Record of Decision (ROD) called for capping, but was changed to incineration to appease public outcry.

EPA, USACE, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection coordinated efforts at the site with the support of the contractor, OHM/IT. Community involvement was a critical component of the success of the site. The Drake site was actually given the highest priority to Region 3's Community Involvement Coordinator (CIC). Booz-Allen Hamilton provided 24 hour on-call public relations coordination at the site. Community involvement tools also included the following:

- Internet site with real-time weather and status reports;
- Computer displayed in the local newspaper office providing public access to the Internet site;
- Monthly newsletter distributed to 11,000 through the mail;
- Daily Situation Reports (SITREPS);
- Frequent press releases;
- Public meetings;
- Site visits by opposition groups;
- Presentations to community groups and schools; and
- Public site tours.

One of the challenges faced by officials at the Drake site included opposition from a vocal group called Arrest the Incinerator Remediation (AIR). The group, whose membership included a Clinton County Commissioner and a former USACE employee, visited the site and approached the National Broadcasting Corporation for a

spot on a news program to voice their concerns. AIR even gained the support of an EPA Ombudsman to recommend stopping the incineration process. EPA and USACE were able to overcome opposition by allowing AIR peer review and winning support of the community by overwhelming the public with information about the site. The abundance of information presented to the public caused the self destruction of AIR, as it was shouted down at a public meeting with Senator Arlen Specter.

One of the unique approaches undertaken at the Drake site included air monitoring with sphagnum moss. Moss hung in bags around the site was periodically analyzed for emissions from the incinerator. The data was so precise from these studies that researchers were able to distinguish when a single engine was running from the amount and type of materials deposited on the moss.

Lessons learned from the Drake site include the following:

- Keep information flowing to the public;
- Be honest when mistakes are made;
- Have a timely, strict review process; and
- Overwhelm the public with supportable facts and data.

Richard Wright: OSHA Safety Audit of Drake Site

Richard Wright reported that the Drake site was recommended for a USACE Division Safety Award. The Superfund Labor Safety Task Force safety auditors stated that the Drake site had the best safety program of any Superfund site. According to Mr. Wright, heavy construction averages 4.4 missed person days per year while the average at the Drake site was 0.55. Reasons for the success of the site include:

- Having a full-time health and safety officer on-site;
- Having excellent lift safety procedures;
- Thorough documentation;
- Adequate training;
- Implementation of a personal safety award program; and
- Supervisor-lead “tool box” safety program based on critical topics.

Mr. Wright also reminded the group that OSHA safety audits are an effective way of evaluating the safety standards in place at a site. Audits provide instruction on corrective action, but do not issue a citation.

Michael Curley: Drake Contractual Successes

Michael Curley reported that the success of the Drake site was due primarily to the ability to convert the remediation contract from a fixed-price contract to a cost-reimbursable contract. Success was also dependent upon the EPA waiver of screening processes for distributing government property. According to Mr. Curley, the most important success at the Drake site was the successful interaction of the team of government agencies

and the contractor.

A bilateral agreement was issued to stop work at the site until concerns from AIR were addressed. Work stopped after incinerator construction and the test burn. The conversion provided a "win-win" situation for both the EPA, USACE, and the contractor, who threatened to force the government to purchase the incinerator during the stop work.

The revised cost-reimbursable contract provided an innovative payment process and established ceilings for phases of the completion of the contract that provided funding for direct cost and labor. In this case, the contractor was willing to accept up to $1 million in charges without any additional fee. The waiver of the screening process for government property protected the contractor from having to absorb excessive costs from the construction of the incinerator.

USACE Programs and Project Delivery System

Bill Brasse announced the culmination of five years of work by the USACE to develop a database with development of an integrated system of databases containing project management information.

Major Luke Leonard: Programs and Project Management Information System

The Programs and Project Management Information System (PROMIS) is an Oracle database developed by the Waterways Experiment Station (WES). Cost information is available that outlines costs from the national level down to specific projects. Links are also provided to the Corps of Engineers Financial Management System (CEFMS). The Programs and Project Delivery System (PPDS) also includes a universal schedules of projects and deliverables with links to the WBS for all tasks.

Bill Brasse commented that the Resident Engineer Management System (RMS) system will also be incorporated into this system. Future versions of the system will allow queries by Superfund programs or areas of expertise.

Senior Management Review Meeting - Day 2

October 20, 1999
0800-1100

Sound Bytes

Cal Curington and Mike Scarano: RECAP Site Monitoring System

Cal Curington and Mike Scarano demonstrated the RECAP system for remote site monitoring. This innovative monitoring technologies allows instantaneous data to be collected from several pilot sites. The remote camera is preset to address specific monitoring needs, but can be controlled directly over the Internet to scan other site areas or zoom in for more detail.

Ken Skahn: Contracts 2000

Ken Skahn reported that there are no significant changes in the Contracts 2000 strategy at this time regarding the interaction of USACE and contractors under Response Action Contracts (RAC). Bunnatine Greenhouse and Betty Bailey are addressing the General Accounting Office (GAO) report finding that direct site payments to contractors implies a direct relationship.

Ken Skahn: Y2K Compliance

All 200 sites tracked for Y2K compliance issues are now thought to be considered satisfactory. The 23 sites identified as potentially Y2K noncompliant underwent corrective measures that fixed the problem.

Ken Skahn: Remedial Action Cost Growth Study

A study of 30 remedial action projects showed a 23% average cost growth. This is down 4% from a previous study and may indicate a trend of diminishing cost growth. Mr. Skahn recommended providing a better system for cost tracking before, during, and after the remedial action.

Ken Skahn: Interagency Agreement Workshops

Interagency Agreement (IAG) training workshops will be held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in July 2000. Training will begin with staff members from the Centers of Expertise and from the USACE financial offices. The course includes material on types of IAGs, direct site payments, and IAG closeout.

Ken Skahn: Operations and Maintenance Workshop

An operations and maintenance (O&M) workshop was held at the Lipari Landfill site in New Jersey. The

workshop included a detailed review of O&M activities that proposed reducing the amount of excess equipment found on-site and using the boilers to reduce volatilization.

Cal Curington: Value Engineering

Mr. Curington urged USACE to redefine what the value is for the Superfund program. Community reuse and performance-based contracting are issues that should be looked at in greater detail. USACE needs to identify how to plan for these issues.

Bill Brasse: CEFMS Queries

CEFMS was developed as an internal system for accounting but was scaled back due to Congressional spending cuts. Although the system does not have the ability to move money between districts, queries can be made through PROMIS to pull information at the district or national level.

John Bartholomeo pointed out that the system shut down once and nearly prevented him from meeting his quota of small business contracts because he could not accept the funds from EPA for these contracts while the system was down. He recommended having manual contingency plans in case of system failures.

Five-Year Reviews

Ric Hines: Introduction

Ric Hines introduced the five-year review discussion by explaining that he works with Marvene Seaman as a technical reviewer of all IAGs. Mr. Hines also provides quality assurance support for five-year reviews conducted by the USACE.

Greg Mellema: Five-Year Reviews in Region 4 and 5

Mr. Mellema reminded the group that the purpose of the five-year review is to ensure protectiveness of human health and the environment. Five-year review activities include the following:

- Review existing data;
- Organizing the review team;
- Conducting site interviews;
- Visiting the site;
- Analyzing data; and
- Preparing the five-year review summary report.

Mr. Mellema recommended testing the operation of equipment and looking for potential cost saving measures during the site visit. In Region 4, USACE reviews have recommended reducing excessive numbers of

monitoring wells to reduce the operation and maintenance costs. Typical reviews identify deficiencies such as vandalism, lost or damaged monitoring wells, eroding cover material, or insufficient analysis during sampling. Costs for a five-year review average roughly $25,000.

Mr. Mellema presented the following recommendations for improving the five-year review process.

- Define activities clearly in the Scope of Work to expedite assembling the review team and drafting schedules;
- Involve RPMs early in the process;
- Identify who is responsible for conducting interviews and provide key contact information;
- Provide more information on the level of detail needed for reporting the costs of operations and maintenance; and
- Reviewers should follow-up to see if recommendations were implemented.

Although protectiveness statements are made by EPA, the USACE reviewer should provide their recommendation for determining the protectiveness of the site. Mr. Mellema recommended establishing a system that determined gradations of protectiveness.

CERCLA/WRDA Collaboration

Sylvina Fonseca: Hylebos Site

The Hylebos Waterway of the Commencement Bay Superfund site was listed on the NPL in 1983. The ROD for the site called for natural remediation, capping, and dredging. The USACE was asked by the stakeholders to dredge the navigation channel and dredge the contaminated sediment simultaneously, although USACE Policy Letter #49 states that USACE policy is not to dredge at Superfund sites. EPA is working with the USACE Civil Works program to address this issue.

Barry Holiday: Civil Works Interaction

Authorities for addressing navigational and environmental dredging are included in the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Ocean Dumping Act, WRDA, and Policy Letter #49. EPA Director Steve Luftig has also called for increased USACE and EPA cooperation to support environmental stewardship. According to Mr. Holiday, many CERCLA materials can be reclassified under the CWA to allow synchronous dredging of contaminated sediment with navigational dredging.

USACE policy is coming that will address strategies for addressing the 70 navigational sites adjacent to Superfund sites. Funding for a future joint plan to address these sites needs to be secured. Some of the policy and statutory issues that must be addressed for this approach to succeed include ensuring the integrity of EPA's enforcement authority and identifying how to share costs.

SUPERFUND REDEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

Melissa Friedland: Superfund Redevelopment Initiative

Melissa Friedland began her presentation by asserting that the future of Superfund sites is redevelopment. The Superfund Redevelopment Initiative was announced at the Avtex Fibers Superfund site. The purpose of redevelopment at Avtex and nine other national pilots was to build on the Brownfields program to facilitate the return of Superfund sites to productive use. The operating principles of the Superfund Redevelopment Initiative include the following:

- Ensure protectiveness;
- Place a high priority on enforcement;
- Accelerate the Superfund process; and
- Do not require a full Record of Decision before implementation.

Ms. Friedland provided several examples of Superfund sites that involved some form of redevelopment. Sites where redevelopment has occurred include:

- Denver Radium;
- Kane and Lombard;
- Arkansas City;
- Miami Drum;
- Woolfolk Chemical;
- Lipari Landfill;
- Anaconda Smelter;
- Bowers Landfill;
- Chisman Creek; and
- Fairchild Semiconductor.

The success of Superfund site redevelopment depends on involving all of the stakeholders and networking with other agencies. Redevelopment also provides incentives for PRPs to work with the purchaser of a site through Prospective Purchase Agreements.

Beverly Getzen: USACE Redevelopment Experience

Beverly Getzen described the USACE potential role in redevelopment of Superfund sites. USACE involvement will improve the overall effectiveness of the process, revitalize local economies, and provide long-term payoffs for both EPA and USACE. The USACE Civil Works Program has expertise applicable to site redevelopment that includes the following:

- Coordination with the public;
- Economic involvement;

- Tradeoff analyses;
- Decision support technology; and
- Ecosystem restoration.

Although the Civil Works has been primarily involved with the Office of Water and Clean Water Act, it is looking to expand its partnership with the EPA. It has demonstrated its experience across the nation and is currently developing a plan for redeveloping the sites of abandoned mines. Ms. Getzen asked that USACE business managers distribute more information about the Civil Works program when corresponding with EPA Project Managers. A new redevelopment office within the Civil Works program is also available to improve coordination between Civil Works and other agencies.

New York Harbor Tour

The group then convened for a tour of New York Harbor aboard the USACE Hayward inspection vessel.

EPA/USACE SUPERFUND PROGRAM

Coordinators Meeting

October 21, 1999
0800-1700

Brainstorming

Cal Curington asked for ideas for next meeting, such as topics the group would like to see or not see next time. He mentioned that the appropriation bill including FY 2000 Superfund funding was signed by the President. William Zobel listed the action items from the Senior Management Review meeting so far:

- Rapid response - using the 10% flat rate;
- O&M workshop in Region 5;
- Community outreach - open and honest role for USACE;
- EPA access to program/project information; and
- Redevelopment 40 pilots/get involved (USACE should serve as a catalyst to help the process along.)

Cal Curington discussed the need to focus on what USACE can do for the customer, in addition to these action items. He suggested that when USACE field staff come to these meetings, they should bring their EPA counterparts. Also need to encourage attendance from EPA Headquarters. Cal Curington stated that they are aware of the flat rate issue and that dialogue is underway.

Jack Mahon expressed his concerns about the current review of the direct cite program process. The worst case scenario would be that EPA and USACE would need to quickly develop alternative approaches.

Tom Simmons said that he thought the invitations to the Senior Management Review were only for those specifically invited, and so he did not invite counterparts. Mr. Curington stated that they should be invited in the future and noted Ms. Greenhouse's recommendation that the contracting team also be involved.

Cal Curington also discussed the Army Inspector General's Annual report which is available on the web. The report states that the accounting problem is spread around USACE. An auditor questioned Mr. Curington about items in the report and a team meeting was called to figure out the answers. Mr. Curington stated that USACE was very close to having a problem with the audit this year, and that USACE would probably have to answer the audit if USACE has the same problems again. Major problem areas include incorrect projects, improper charges, travel, and unsupported transactions. The audit was a statistical sample, and would equal about 10% of the gross for all of USACE. He reminded the group that mistakes should be repaired immediately. He also pointed out that some districts did very well.

Cal Curington discussed the use of cost reimbursement contracting by the customer. He stated that USACE is relying on folks in Rapid Response to be instructors and help initiate projects using cost reimbursable contracting. He also stated that team members need to be ready psychologically for cost reimbursement contracts. Some options include the continued use of start up teams, the use of tiger teams, and involvement from the Center of Expertise (CX).

Tom Simmons stated that cost reimbursable contracts require audits and that IAGs cannot be closed out until the money balances. Quick close outs are the solution and USACE needs to make it clear to EPA that the ability to close out the IAGs can be held up.

In smaller districts, changing to cost reimbursable contracts is a concern because they will have to go to bigger districts for money. Tom Simmons stated that it is important that districts should communicate so they are able to move money and resources around. There are not many nation-wide contracts; USACE might want to make a point of doing nation wide contracts. A section on the USACE home page that shows all the contracts that all PMs could find so that everyone can see what's available was brought up as an idea for communication among districts.

Ric Hines stated that CX tried to maintain a list of Total Environmental Restoration Contract (TERC), Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC), and Rapid Response contracts, but the database didn't get any district feedback and was too cumbersome. He said that the database was not a good place to pull information from. An idea would be to narrow down the database to specific information such as who to call, if it is a TERC or BRAC, when it expires, etc. Possibly, Division Coordinators could set up the database. Bob Warda will send out a message to all Division Coordinators asking for volunteers that would like to work on the database.

Ken's Corner

Ken Skahn discussed the creation of a photo library of before, during, and after construction photos. The library can provide wide access to photos for presentations for Congress and other groups. He requested that the group provide photos of sites they are working on to put in the library. The system now contains about 500 photos for 100 sites. The pictures currently in the system are older pictures, mostly from USACE sites. William Zobel said that EPA Headquarters is trying to get additional photos to be scanned in and would like to have up to 10 pictures for each National Priorities List (NPL) sites.

William Zobel then demonstrated the web site, found at http://dynstev.dyncorp.com/photo.htm. The site has a basic search that can use the site name, CERCLIS ID, State, or Region. When the site name is clicked, a brief history and summary of the site will appear. The advanced search on the site can use the address, territory, site characteristics, reuse planned, Federal facility, image quality, or source.

It was suggested that the USACE digital library could be used for good resolution photos. It was also suggested that a link to the advanced site query on EPA's web page be created to this one.

Monthly Reports

Ken Skahn: Draft Model Monthly Report

Ken Skahn presented a draft model Monthly Report for discussion. The report had the following categories:

- General information
- Scope of work
- Schedule
- Percent complete
- Summary of work
- USACE personnel billing time
- Projects issues and concerns
  - list anticipated future actions or deadlines
  - explain costs and reports they need to see, etc.
  - explain any needs to extend deadlines,
  - list equipment needs
  - list property acquisitions
  - explain any shutdowns or releases
  - list health and safety issues
  - document community issues
  - list lessons learned
- Change orders/claims
- Visitors
- Projected work/estimate cost
- Summary of waste sent offsite (type, quantity, who approved accepting facility)
- Sample data summary (explain anomalies or spikes)
- Statement of charges

Ken Skahn stated that they would like to standardize the Monthly Reports to be able to track information easier. Ric Hines stated that not all Remedial Project Managers (RPMs) want this much information in the Monthly Reports and that they may be labor intensive. Hines said that he thinks the usual issue is that not all of the key players get a copy of the report.

Bob Warda: Monthly Reports Used Currently

Bob Warda made a presentation on the Monthly Reports that the eight districts in Regions 5 and 8 create. He stated that this type of report is good documentation, especially for projected work. They are also good for an audit trail and are more consistent with contractor submissions. He said that these reports assure EPA that they have control of the project and have a good understanding of progress. These reports help to show how much money is needed to get the job done and also shows all expenditures. He also stated that they have been doing

these type of reports for about two years. The reports are from one to six pages and 50% of the reports is standard with just a few numbers changing.

Joe D'Agosta asked about attaching bills if these reports are to be sent via email. It was suggested that a PDF file might work. Bob Warda stated that everything would be forwarded in paper format after the electronic copies were sent, so the original bills would be attached to that.

Joe D'Agosta asked which material definitely needed to be in the report so that USACE can figure out how much manpower it will take to complete the reports. Ken Skahn stated that the note "doesn't apply" can be placed in different sections where there is nothing to report. He stated that this was just a draft that needs to be shown to the RPMs. It would be nice to fit these into CEFMS; if they were standardized, they could be rolled up for the entire country. It would give the PROMIS system the chance to catch up. PMs would need to know what data is available instead of duplicating it, then add issues and concerns to the report. PMs need to get to a point where they can pull data from other sources as much as possible, but these systems have to be populated to be able to pull data from.

Bob Warda said that this discussion shows the difference between USACE and contractors; contractors do what EPA wants. William Zobel stated that he thinks the biggest issue is that EPA wants to know about everything that goes on and to be kept in the loop.

Five-Year Reviews

Greg Mellema stated five-year reviews are similar to the reports that are done on the civil works side. He said that USACE will want to use the new guidance to perform five-year reviews and that he will distribute it once it is finalized. He also pointed out that in reviewing existing documents, usually the hang up is getting the documents together in the first place. Oftentimes, there is only one copy of certain documents and it takes a lot of up front work. It would be nice to have a central file for all information on a site. He stated that teams should have 2-3 technical reviewers, all with significant design experience. He also said that it would be good to have a central point of contact, such as the PM. In a way, five-year reviews are filler work and are not a long-term project. Sometimes it is hard to get a good team together to complete them. CX can supplement the teams to a degree, but there is a limited amount of people and resources available.

One previous issue was whether or not there should be a surprise visit. Greg Mellema stated that he thinks that there should not be a surprise visit because site preparation is necessary in most cases. For example, the site may need mowing or the team may need someone to escort them with keys to gates. The five-year review team should operate various pieces of equipment and look for ways to save money. The team may need to have the O&M contractor along on the site visit. The team should come up with recommendations and document things like excess equipment on the site. The five-year review team should have a good overview of the site together and then break off into specific expertise. For example, the chemical engineer should look at the water treatment plant. The team should perform data analysis and look for trends that the plume is contained or that contaminants are going down. The team should come up with exit strategies that are not

addressed in the Record of Decision (ROD), for example, when can a pump and treat system be turned off. The five-year review report should be about 30 pages, and should contain photos and figures. The report should provide a snapshot of what the site was like so that in five years, the site can be compared. Greg Mellema stated that to start the five-year review process, the team first needs to become familiar with the program and needs to look objectively at capabilities and resources.

Greg Mellema stated that five-year review work is available in the Regions, but USACE needs to be pro-active in contacting the Regions. The ability to form teams across District boundaries is important in fulfilling needs. Ken Skahn stated that there is a point of contact in each Region for five-year reviews. Jack Mahon asked why USACE could not expand their ability to react to these reviews by looking to contractors to do them. He said that it may be a new vehicle for USACE to use contractors. Cal Curington said that USACE would like to start with a nucleus of expertise from the CX, then expand after there is enough experience.

It was mentioned that USACE could use an Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) vehicle, but it would need to be cheap. With contractors, administration would make the hours to complete the review 40-50 instead of 20-30. Jack Mahon stated that USACE needs to offer the best package for the client to get the reviews done.

Ken Skahn stated that one good reason for USACE to do these reviews was that in the past, USACE never got back to see the design of landfill caps or other construction that USACE completed. While doing reviews, USACE can see what they have been involved with.

Ken Skahn asked if the checklists that USACE are currently using are from the new five-year review guidance. Greg Mellema stated that they are currently using a USACE checklist, but they are still using the site inspection checklist from the old guidance.

Ric Hines asked if there was some kind of fact sheet that USACE could use for the Regions. A list of points of contact should be sent out.

Ric Hines said that it is up to the Regions as far as what they are going to do to get the reviews done, but some Regions have expressed an interest. Doing the reviews would be a way to get a foot in the door and could lead to other work. There are many reviews that will need to be completed in the next three years, about 200 a year, including overdue reports that EPA is trying to catch up on. A running total should be sent out to USACE Division Coordinators.

Property Administration/Disposal Requirements

Mike Curly started his presentation by saying that he wanted to make it very clear that this is not Baltimore District policy. He stated that USACE needs to be pro-active in dealing with property. USACE should use the Defense Industrial Supply Center, because there is a 40% discount. Also, onsite auction houses can be used to get rid of the equipment.

At the Drake site, USACE did not have a lot of expertise and no guidance. Cost contracting has hefty requirements for property management. USACE called Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service (DRMS) to see if they could help, but they did not have expertise. Logistics Management Office (LMO) was also called, but they were not the right people. DOD decides how the government carries out policy, but contractors cannot use government procedures. Sites have to have a property administration plan. At Drake, USACE brought in Title 2 consultants to help them out and train them. A USACE guidance is needed because unknowingly people can break property laws. Property administration is not guidance, it is a law. It is paid for under the contract, so USACE would have to manage it.

The Drake site had five positions for property administration. Cost contracting should make it very clear what the contractor has to perform. You cannot bill for buying office equipment for non-related offices, secretarial services, etc. There has to be an inventory schedule to finish contracts. The common theme is where is the customer's property. Government property is a hot topic. There is $120 billion of government property in contractor's hands.

Property administration requires a property control system. You need to know what type of property comes in and out of the system. The contractor is accountable for all government property and all of it must be in writing. Ken Skahn asked why so much equipment was bought at Drake. Mike Curly said that an economic analysis showed that it was cheaper to furnish property because the contractor pay rate includes the cost of materials. Joe D'Agosta asked who did the economic analysis. Mike Curly said that it was a team effort.

Mike Curly said that the property administrator is appointed to the position and is supposed to have experience and training. The plant clearance officer has requirements under the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA) for certain courses that must be taken.

In order to close the contract out for property, all property damaged, destructed, or transferred must be reported, and the balance of all equipment must be zero. These requirements apply to contracts that total over $70 million, or that are between $30-70 million, if it is in the best interest of the government. Mike stated that there is a real need for a USACE guidance.

Mike said that USACE should establish a Center of Property Excellence which could meet the needs of the customer and maximize capabilities and resources. The benefits would be that it would reduce administrative costs, minimize property risks, and eliminate layers of bureaucracy. Jim Strait asked who was working at Headquarters on property policy. Cal Curington said that Rhea Cohen is the USACE Headquarters point of contact. Each contract should have a section on property administration above $500,000 of property.

Jim Strait asked if there is a property clearinghouse in order to transfer out equipment to others. USACE should set up an equipment center on the web site. This would be a way to get more money for the customer.

Psychological Effects of Relocation

Jan Shubert: Stresses Caused by Superfund Sites

Pat Seppi asked the group to reflect on the question, "Does EPA and USACE have a moral obligation to provide stress counseling to the people they are relocating?" She stated that a lot of the problems that the people are facing are really stress-related.

Jan Shubert pointed out the kinds of stresses that people are involved with when there is a Superfund site in their backyard. Stress is situation where we do not have enough resources to cope with the situation. She explained that there are two kinds of stress - eustress (healthy stress) and distress (unhealthy stress). Two types of distress are acute stress (which comes and goes) and chronic stress (which is long-term).

Our bodies need to figure out what the stress is, then react to it. Humans have four ways to react to stress: emotional, physical, cognitive, and behavioral responses. Relocation will multiply stresses because people are losing communities and stability. Temporary relocations can be harder than permanent relocations because people have to move twice.

How people react to stress depends on how they deal with things, if they can roll with the punches. Two ways of dealing with stress are to either deal with the problem or deal with how you feel. In dealing with problem, people feel the need to try to fix problem, but they can not change the Superfund site or just make it go away. If people can deal with their feelings instead of the situation, they can adjust to the situation. Coping skills depend on how much of a support system a person has and what type of person they are. Stress can help you grow, gain new skills, and grow self-esteem. However, the negative side effects can include health problems like high blood pressure or emotional problems like nervous breakdowns.

In natural disasters, there is relatively little warning and no control over what happens. However, there is usually little long-term uncertainty and the results are visible. With a Superfund type situation, a person cannot remember what it was like before, because they do not remember when the problem started. The low point is not readily available. There is a total lose of control and major long-term uncertainties. People at Superfund sites suddenly have new worries such as not knowing what health effects the site will have on them or if they can find another house.

Stressors for people living near hazardous waste sites include loss of control, uncertainty, anger, strains on family, feelings of isolation, and frustration with working with agencies. Uncertainty probably causes the most stress. Sometimes, people are frightened off by the "wrong" risks. This is an area where the agencies need to interact more effectively with the community.

Pat Seppi: Example of a Relocation Site

Pat Seppi stated that the agencies would be able to predict community response to the site better if the

communities were incorporated into the decision processes earlier. Communities need to know that the agencies cannot provide quick fixes.

She used one site, Federal Creosote, as an example of how to interact with the community. The site was discovered when, in April 96, someone in the community noticed a dark liquid coming through their sump pump. Shortly thereafter, a well exploded. It was discovered that the site housed a former wood treating facility that had two big lagoons with canals with creosote in them. When the facility closed, they demolished the buildings into lagoons and covered them with soil. It was decided that the only way to clean up the site was to demolish homes in the area and clean up the creosote. Pat Seppi said that EPA does not only buy out homes for health reasons; they are also bought for engineering reasons (e.g., need to get at the contaminants to clean up or need somewhere to put equipment). EPA tried to work quickly on the Federal Creosote site to get it onto the NPL and ensure that Federal money would keep coming in and be able to take care of drinking water and the contamination. However, for the residents, being a Superfund site was negative because property values would plummet.

The resident's primary concern was what would happen next. There has still been no construction on the site because of the bureaucracy. For the residents, it is hard to accept that the science is not concrete enough to make a definitive statement about their health. Also, the government does not always have the best credibility. What the residents know is that some industry or government has betrayed them. The residents do not understand why they need to follow procedures, they just want to be taken care of.

Pat Seppi stated that government officials need to work to try to understand what people are going through and that the agencies should not see them the way they are at the meetings. She said that they are good people just going through a lot of stress.

Tom Simmons stated that if you can actively do something you sometimes feel better. He asked if there was any type of activity that residents can do. Pat Seppi stated that one way to get involved is community advisory groups composed of stakeholders with a real interest in the site. It is the job of this group to disseminate information throughout the community. Residents can send out information with telephone trees. Ms. Seppi also said that the community can also use a technical assistance grant (TAG) to hire a consultant that the community can use for information. Also, the Retired Senior Volunteers Program is a way that people can get involved.

Mike Scarano suggested that the format of public meeting is the key to keeping aggressiveness in the community down. He suggested that public availability meetings with panel discussions be held before the public meeting. This way, only a few people would be left as an audience for those that want to get on their soap box.

Business Manager Update

Mike Scarano asked if there were any questions about the role of business manager. Jim Strait asked if there

was anybody in Headquarters managing the role or if there was a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP). Mike stated that the role should really be geared to each Region in order to work. He said that individual RPMs have a lot of leniency and that he has gotten a lot of work by one-on-one meetings and knowing the customer and what they need.

Mike Scarano stated that in Region 2, he had a very good head start because the Region requested this arrangement back in 1992. Mike has some materials that show the IAG language for his arrangement that he will send out by request. Bob Warda stated that Region 5 is looking to putting someone in as a business manager.

Cal Curington thanked everyone who attended, and Mike Scarano and Region 2 for helping out.

IAG Workshop Highlights

Ric Hines showed a slide on how many IAGs have been processed. There were three "blips" on the chart representing increases because of Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act (SARA), work on the Bayou Bonfouca and Baird McGuire sites, and the methyl parathion projects. Ric stated that 70% of the money is for construction and the remaining 30% includes money for design and technical assistance.

Ric Hines described a 8-10 hour training course held in Philadelphia for 40 people. He said that there was not enough time and there were too many people. In the future, the course will be an EPA course held on a site by site basis. He is aiming to hold a course in January or February in Region 5 and in Albuquerque in November for Regions 8 and 9 and for Headquarters. The class size will be cut down to 20. In the first course, four hours was spent on cost recovery, and four hours was spent on IAGs. Future course will use one hour for cost recovery and seven for IAGs. The targets for the workshops are the PM and RPM and people working directly with the IAGs. All types of IAGs will be discussed during the course. Generic IAGs and how to process work forms that go along with generic IAGs will be discussed. IAGs should be for a specific project and for a specific type of work (e.g., RD, RA, technical assistance). Remedial design and remedial action should not be put together. Five-year reviews should have a separate IAG. Special conditions associated with each IAG, category class codes for the budgeting system, roles of CX, historical information about IAGs, and detailed information on direct fund sites and cost reimbursable contracts will be discussed. All IAGs require Monthly Reports. These will also be discussed in the class. Closeout of IAGs will also be discussed. The balances need to match in order to close out the IAG. Generic IAGs can have 30-50 assignments on them which causes a paperwork nightmare. The process of where the work will go will also be discussed. Usually, the Region will say where they want the agreement to go. Headquarters has to determine special needs of customer. With IAGs that do not have set districts, Headquarters will usually call the Division Coordinator for help. Generally, IAGs should go to the District that is doing the majority of the work.

Appendix 1: Coordinators Meeting Attendee List

Name	Organization	Official Symbol/ Region	Telephone Number
Rick Alvarez	USACE	CENAN	(214) 264-4654
Shaheer Alvi	EPA	Region 2	(212) 637-4324
Larry R. Anderson	USACE	CENWD-NP-PM-M	(503) 808-3744
Doris Ahearn			(202) 637-3245
Dan Allen	USACE	CEMP-RS	(202) 301-0450
Sylvio Aln	USACE	CENAN-PP-E	(212) 264-0126
Lateza Ballard	EPA	Region 2	(212) 637-4347
John Bartholomeo	USACE	CENAP-DP-M	(215) 656-6927
Tom Billings	USACE	CESAD-PM	(404) 562-5211
Bill Brasse	USACE	CEMP-RS	(202) 761-0414
Anita Brown	EPA	ERRD	(212) 637-4350
Donald Bruce	EPA	Region 5	(312) 886-7241
Miguel Cintron	USACE	CENWO-PM	(404) 221-7705
Beth Coffey	USACE	CENWS	(206) 764-4478
Mike Curley	USACE	CENAB	(717) 782-3750
Calvin Curington	USACE	CEMP-RS	(202) 761-1064
Joseph D'Agosta	USACE	NAD	(718) 491-8773
John Davidson	USACE	CESPD-PM-M	(415) 977-8245
Joe Donovan	USACE	CENWK-EX-EB	(816) 983-3587
Silvina Fonseca	EPA	OERR	(703) 603-8799
Dan Forger	EPA	Region 2	(212) 637-4402
Melissa Friedland	EPA	OERD	(703) 603-8864
John Frisco	EPA	Region 2	(212) 637-4400
Richard Gajdek	USACE	CENAN-PP-E	(212) 264-0137
Beverley Getzen	USACE	CECW-PE	(202) 761-1980
Tim Gordon	USACE	CEMP-RS	(202) 761-1773
Bunnatine Greenhouse	USACE	CEMP-ZA	(202) 761-8642

Judith Gutierrez	USACE	RE-E	(504) 862-2575
Greg Herring	USACE	CENWO-PM-HA	(402) 221-7712
John C. Hess	USACE	CESAJ-EN-OH	(904) 232-2524
Ric Hines	USACE	CX	(402) 697-2624
Barry Holiday	USACE	CECW-OD	(202) 761-8832
Tracy Hopkins	EPA	EPA HQ	(703) 603-8788
Tom Hudspeth	USACE	CENWO-HX-G	(214) 767-2177
Stan Kinmonth	USACE	CESAJ	(904) 323-1113
John Kirschbaum	USACE	CENWO-PM-H	(402) 221-7714
Lawrence Leahy	USACE	CENWK-CO-FC	(402) 221-7714
Major Luke Leonard	USACE	CEMP-M	(202) 761-0770
Don Lynch	EPA	Region 2	(219) 637-4419
Rich McCollum	USACE	CENWK-PM-E	(816) 983-3370
Greg Mellema	USACE	CENWO-HX-G	(402) 693-2658
Althea Milburn	USACE	CEMP-RS	(202) 761-1601
Stan McAlpin	USACE	CEMUD-PM-E	(601)634-5431
Mike McGagh	EPA	Region 1	(617) 918-1428
Theresa Zang McMillan	USACE	CENAO-PM	(857) 441-7001
Kevin Mould	EPA	EPA HQ	(703) 603-8728
Anand R. Mudambi	EPA	OERR/AOC	(703) 603-8796
Jim Mullins	EPA	Region 6	(214) 665-2273
Mary O'Mara	USACE	CELRB-PE-EE	(703) 603-8884
Don Ohnstead	USACE	CENWA-HX	(402) 697-2615
Jared Olsen	USACE	CENAB	(410) 962-6745
Mike Otis	USACE	NAE-PD-E	(978) 318-8895
David Polish	EPA	Region 3	(215) 814-3327
Nancy M. Porter	USACE	CEMP-RS	(202) 761-5245
Larry Reed	EPA	EPA HQ	(703) 603-7960
Craig Roberts	USACE	CEMP-RS	(202) 761-5517

BG Steve Rhoades	USACE	CENAD	(718) 491-8802
John Sassi	USACE	CENAD-PM	(718) 491-8754
Mike Scarano	USACE	CENAD-PM-E	
Peter Schall	EPA	Region 3	(215) 814-3183
Tom Simmons	USACE	NWK	(816) 983-3372
Ken Skahn	EPA	OERR	(703) 603-8801
Nash Sood	USACE	CEMP-RS	(202) 761-8618
Jim Strait	USACE	CEMP-RS	(202) 761-0414
Richard Taylor	EPA	OERR Region 4-10 Center	(703) 603-8922
Tammy Thompson	USACE	CESAM-RE-A	(334) 690-3297
Mike Trial	USACE	CENKW	(816) 983-3203
Dan Tosoni	USACE	CENWD-MR-PM-H	(402) 697-2622
Mavio E. Villamarzo	EPA	Region 4	(404) 562-8912
Bob Warda	USACE	CELRD (GL) - P	(312) 353-3679
Captain Robert Whittle	USACE	CENAD	(718) 491-8803
Don William	EPA	Region 6	(214) 665-2197
Tina Williams	EPA	OERR	(703) 603-0262
Rich Wright	USACE	CESO-Safety	(202) 961-8565

Appendix 2:

SMR and Coordinators Meeting Agendas

Superfund Senior Management Review (SMR), 19-20 October 1999

U. S. Army Corps of Engineers and U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
In the EPA Region 2 Office, 27th Floor, Conference Rooms A & B, 290 Broadway, New York, NY 10007

Tuesday, 19 October 1999, conference room A		**Presenters****
0800-0830	REGISTRATION RECAP continuous display	Althea Milburn, HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS DOE/FETC representatives
0830-0845	MEETING FACILITATION	Bill Zobel, DynCorp I & ET, Inc.
	WELCOME, announcements	Bill Brasse, HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS Branch Chief Ken Skahn, HQ EPA Liaison
0845-0900	INTRODUCTORY SPEAKERS	Richard Caspe, Director, Emergency and Remedial Response Division, EPA Region 2 BG Stephen Rhoades, Commander, USACE/CENAD Larry Reed, Deputy Director, HQ EPA/ OERR Bunnatine Greenhouse, Principal Assistant Responsible for Contracting, HQ USACE
0900-0930	SUPERFUND PROGRAM STATUS Program trends, legislative actions Funding overview	 John Smith, HQ EPA/ OERR Jim Strait, HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS
0930--0945	Q & A	
0945-1015	ONE DOOR TO THE CORPS	Shaheer Alvi, EPA Region 2 Michael Scarano, USACE/ CENAD
1015-1030	Q & A	
1030-1045	BREAK	
1045-1130	REMOVALS/ REMEDIAL SEAMLESS TRANSITION PILOT Garland Creosote Site, Longview, TX	Jim Mullins, EPA Region 6 John Kirschbaum, USACE Rapid Response Larry Leahy, USACE Rapid Response
1130-1145	Q & A	
1145-1330	LUNCH	
1330-1430	RELOCATION PROJECTS Community Outreach Relocation, temporary and permanent	Pat Seppi, EPA Region 2 (moderator) Cal Curington, HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS (moderator) John Hansen, EPA Region 2 Judith Gutierrez, USACE/ CEMVN Tammy Thompson, USACE/ CESAM
1430-1445	Q & A	

*****To contact presenters, please see last page.***

1445-1500	BREAK	
1500-1545	DRAKE SITE SUCCESS STORIES	
	Community Involvement activities	David Polish, EPA Region 3
	Site safety measures	Richard Wright, HQ USACE/ CESO-I
	Lowest Reasonable Cost management	Michael Curley, USACE/ CENAB
	Property disposal, Lessons Learned	
1545-1600	Q & A	
1600-1630	USACE PROGRAMS & PROJECT DELIVERY SYSTEM	MAJ Luke Leonard, HQ USACE/ CEMP-M Bill Brasse, HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS
1630-1645	Q & A	
1645-1900	SERIOUS NETWORKING	

Wednesday, 20 October 1999, conference room B

		Presenters**
0800-0830	SOUND BYTES: RECAP Contracts 2000 Y2K Review findings, what to expect Remedial Action Cost Growth Study O & M Workshop and IAG Workshop Value Engineering CEFMS queries	Ken Skahn, HQ EPA/ OERR Cal Curington, HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS Bill Brasse, HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS
0830-0900	FIVE-YEAR REVIEWS Regions 4 and 5	Greg Mellema, USACE/ CEMRO-HX Ric Hines, USACE/ CEMRO-HX
0900-0915	Q & A	
0915-0930	BREAK	
0930-1015	CERCLA/ WRDA COLLABORATION Hylebos Site, Tacoma, WA	Silvina Fonseca, HQ EPA/ OERR Barry Holliday, HQ USACE/CECW-O Branch Chief
1015-1030	Q & A	
1030-1115	SUPERFUND REDEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE	Melissa Friedland, HQ EPA/ OERR Beverly Getzen, HQ USACE/ CECW-PF
1115-1130	Q & A	
1130.	INSPECTION of the NY/NJ harbor, on board The Hayward. Lunch and soft drinks will be provided on board to all who paid in advance at time of registration on 19 October. Directions for walking and public transportation between EPA office and pier will be distributed.	

***To contact presenters, please see last page.*

SMR PRESENTERS & CEMP-RS PARTICIPANTS, October 19-20, 1999

name	office	telephone	e-mail
Allen, Dan	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS (Intergov. & Superfund Support Branch)	(202) 761-0450	daniel.s.allen@usace.army.mil
Alvi, Shaheer	EPA Region 2, Superfund Contact for USACE	(212) 637-4324	alvi.shaheer@epa.gov
Brasse, Bill	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS Chief (Intergov. & Superfund Support Branch)	(202) 761-8879	bill.w.brasse@usace.army.mil
Cohen, Rhea	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS, Advance SMR Coordinator	(202) 761-7584	rhea.l.cohen@usace.army.mil
Curington, Cal	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS, Superfund Team Leader	(202) 761-1064	calvin.f.curington@usace.army.mil
Curley, Michae	lUSACE/ CENAB (Baltimore District), Contracts Admin. Team Leader	(570) 748-4505	michael.j.curley@usace.army.mil
Fonseca, Silvina	HQ EPA/ OERR, Regions 4/10 Center	(703) 603-8799	fonseca.silvina@epa.gov
Friedland, Melissa	HQ EPA/ OERR, Regions 4/10 Center	(703) 603-8864	friedland.melissa@epa.gov
Getzen, Beverly	HQ USACE/ CECW-PF (Floodplain & Initiatives Branch)	(202) 761-1980	beverley.b.getzen@usace.army.mil
Gordon, Tim	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS (Intergov. & Superfund Support Branch)	(202) 761-1773	timothy.d.gordon@usace.army.mil
Gutierrez, Judith	USACE/ CEMVN (New Orleans District)	(504) 862-2575	judith.y.gutierrez@usace.army.mil
Hansen, John	EPA Region 2, Remedial Project Manager	(212) 637-3915	hansen.john@epa.gov
Hines, Eric (Ric)	USACE/ CEMRO-HX (HTRW Center of Expertise)	(402) 697-2624	eric.d.hines@usace.army.mil
Holliday, Barry	HQ USACE/ CECW-OD Chief (Dredging & Navigation Branch)		(202) 761-8832 barry.w.holliday@usace.army.mil
Kirschbaum, John	USACE Rapid Response Program Manager	(402) 221-7714	john.p.kirschbaum@usace.army.mil
Leahy, Larry	USACE Rapid Response Project Engineer	(402) 293-2531	lawrence.k.leahy@usace.army.mil
Leonard, MAJ Luke	HQ USACE/ CEMP-M (Program Management Div.)	(202) 761-0770	luke.t.leonard@usace.army.mil
Mellema, Greg	USACE/ CEMRO-HX (HTRW Center of Expertise)	(402) 697-2658	gregory.j.mellema@usace.army.mil
Milburn, Althea	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS, Admin. Support for SMR/Coord. Mtgs.	(202) 761-1601	allthea.b.milburn@usace.army.mil
Mullins, Jim	EPA Region 6, Team Leader, Removal Team 1	(214) 665-2273	mullins.james@epa.gov
Poindexter, Larry	USACE/ CEMVN (New Orleans District)	(504) 862-2937	larry.poindexter@usace.army.mil
Polish, David	EPA Region 3, Community Involvement Coordinator	(215) 814-3327	polish.david@epa.gov
Porter, Nancy	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS (Intergov. & Superfund Support Branch)	(202) 761-5245	nancy.m.porter@usace.army.mil
Roberts, Craig	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS, Onsite SMR Coordinator	(202) 761-5517	craig.c.roberts@usace.army.mil
Scarano, Michael	USACE/ CENAD (N. Atlantic Div.), Business Mgr. with EPA Reg. 2	(718) 491-8763	michael.scarano@usace.army.mil
Seppi, Patricia	HQ EPA/ OERR, Region 2, Community Involvement Coordinator	(212) 637-3679	seppi.pat@epa.gov
Skahn, Ken	HQ EPA/ OERR, Reg. 5/7 Ctr.,Superfund Liaison to USACE	(703) 603-8801	skahn.ken@epa.gov
Sood, Nash	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS (Intergov. & Superfund Support Branch)	(202) 761-8618	nash.sood@usace.army.mil
Smith, John	HQ EPA/ OERR, Senior Process Manager	(703) 603-8802	smith.johnj@epa.gov
Strait, Jim	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS (Intergov. & Superfund Support Branch)	(202) 761-0414	jim.c.strait@usace.army.mil
Thompson, Flora (Tammy)	HQUSACE/ CESAM (Mobile District)	(334) 690-3297	flora.l.thompson@usace.army.mil
Wright, Richard	HQ USACE/ CESO-I (Safety & Occupational Health Office)	(202) 761-8565	richard.l.wright@usace.army.mil

Superfund Coordinators Meeting, 21 October 1999

U. S. Army Corps of Engineers and U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
In the EPA Region 2 Office, 27th Floor, Conference Room B, 290 Broadway, New York, NY 10007

Thursday, 21 October 1999, conference room B

		Presenters**
0800-0830	FACILITATOR	Bill Zobel, DynCorp I & ET, Inc.
	REVIEW OF SMR	Bill Brasse, Chief, CEMP-RS
0830-0845	KEN'S CORNER	Ken Skahn, HQ EPA/ OERR Liaison to HQ USACE
0845-0930	MONTHLY REPORTS Discussion of draft model report	Ken Skahn, HQ EPA/ OERR Bob Warda, CELRD Bill Brasse, CEMP-RS
0930-0945	Q & A	
0945-1000	BREAK	
1000-1030	CONDUCTING 5-YEAR REVIEWS How-To for geographical districts	Ric Hines, CEMRO-HX Greg Mellema, CEMRO-HX
1030-1045	Q & A	
1045-1115	PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION/ DISPOSAL REQUIREMENTS Recommendations for cost contracting	Mike Curley, CENAB
1115-1130	Q & A	
1130-1315	LUNCH	
1315-1445	THE PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF RELOCATION, EPA Course	Pat Seppi, EPA Region 2 Jan Shubert, HQ EPA
1445-1500	BREAK	
1500-1545	BUSINESS MANAGER UPDATE Panel discussion	Mike Scarano, CENAD Bob Warda, CELRD
1545-1600	Q & A	
1600-1630	IAG WORKSHOP HIGHLIGHTS	Ric Hines, CENWO-HX
1630-1645	Q & A	
1645	Adjourn	*****To contact presenters, please see next page.***

USACE COORDINATORS MEETING, October 21, 1999
PRESENTERS & CEMP-RS PARTICIPANTS

name	office	telephone	e-mail
Allen, Dan	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS (Intergov. & Superfund Support Branch)	(202) 761-0450	daniel.s.allen@usace.army.mil
Brasse, Bill	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS Chief (Intergov. & Superfund Support Branch) bill.w.brasse@usace.army.mil		(202) 761-8879
Cohen, Rhea	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS, Advance Coordinator of SMR/Coord. Mtgs. rhea.l.cohen@usace.army.mil		(202) 761-7584
Curington, Cal	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS, Superfund Team Leader	(202) 761-1064	calvin.f.curington@usace.army.mil
Curley, Michael	USACE/ CENAB (Baltimore District), Contracts Admin. Team Leader michael.j.curley@usace.army.mil		(570) 748-4505
Gordon, Tim	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS (Intergov. & Superfund Support Branch)	(202) 761-1773	timothy.d.gordon@usace.army.mil
Hines, Eric (Ric)	USACE/ CEMRO-HX (HTRW Center of Expertise)	(402) 697-2624	eric.d.hines@usace.army.mil
Mellema, Greg	USACE/ CEMRO-HX (HTRW Center of Expertise)	(402) 697-2658	gregory.j.mellema@usace.army.mil
Milburn, Althea	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS, Admin. Support for SMR/Coord. Mtgs	(202) 761-1601	allthea.b.milburn@usace.army.mil
Porter, Nancy	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS (Intergov. & Superfund Support Branch)	(202) 761-5245	nancy.m.porter@usace.army.mil
Roberts, Craig	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS, Onsite Coordinator of SMR/Coord. Mtgs.	(202) 761-5517	craig.c.roberts@usace.army.mil
Scarano, M.	USACE/ CENAD (N. Atlantic Div.), Business Manager	(718) 491-8763	michael.scarano@usace.army.mil
Seppi, Patricia	EPA Region 2, Community Involvement Coordinator	(212) 637-3679	seppi.pat@epamail.epa.gov
Shubert, Jan	HQ EPA/ OERR, Community Involvement & Outreach Center	(703) 603-8737	shubert.jan@epamail.epa.gov
Skahn, Ken	HQ EPA/ OERR Superfund Liaisonto USACE	(703) 603-8801	skahn.ken@epamail.epa.gov
Sood, Nash	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS (Intergov. & Superfund Support Branch)	(202) 761-8618	nash.sood@usace.army.mil
Strait, Jim	HQ USACE/ CEMP-RS (Intergov. & Superfund Support Branch)	(202) 761-0414	jim.c.strait@usace.army.mil
Warda, Bob	USACE/ CELRD (Lakes and River Division), Business Manager	(312) 353-3679	robert.f.warda@usace.army.mil
Weber, Scott	USACE/ CESWD (Southwestern Division), Business Manager	(214) 767-2406	scott.weber@usace.army.mil